

# ATLANTIS

This is ATLANTIS, a journal of postal Diplomacy, edited and published by Deborah and Christopher Schleicher, 5122 W. Carmen Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60630.

ATLANTIS is affiliated with the IFW Diplomacy Society. The editor is a member of The Diplomacy Association.

Subscriptions to ATLANTIS are \$1.50 for 10 issues.

## THE CONVOY ORDER

by

John J. Beshara

In the new Rulebook just published by Games Research, Section XII explains "The Convoy Order." There are some rather complicated situations not covered in Section XII, which could confuse players, especially the large number of newcomers to postal play.

### Example 1

ENGLAND: A Edi-Hol, F Nth C A Edi-Hol, A Bel S A Edi-Hol, F Eng S F Nth.

GERMANY: F Hol-Nth, F Den S F Hol-Nth.

Because two opposing units are attempting to move with equal support into and out of Holland via the North Sea, a standoff occurs. If Germany moved F Den-Nth, F Hol S F Den-Nth, then the English movee would succeed in dislodging F Holland.

### Example 2

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel, F Eng C A Lon-Bel, F Nth S A Lon-Bel.

FRANCE: F Bel-Eng, F Bre S F Bel-Eng.

While England is moving to Belgium with one valid support, the move does not succeed because the unsupported convoying fleet is dislodged.

[continued on page 2]

Example 3

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel, F Eng C A Lon-Bel, F Nth S A Lon-Bel.

FRANCE: F Bre-Eng, F Bel S F Bre-Eng.

GERMANY: A Ruh-Bel, A Hol S A Ruh-Bel.

Paragraph 5 of Section XII states: "If a convoyed army attacks a fleet which is supporting a fleet which is attacking one of the convoying fleets, that support is not cut." At the same time, the rules in Section X state: "If a unit ordered to support in a given space is attacked from a space different from the one into which it is giving support, or is dislodged by an attack from any space, including the one into which it is giving support, then its support is cut. The unit that was to have received that support then does not receive it."

According to Section X, as quoted, A Lon-Bel does cut the support of F Belgium because A London is attacking "from a space different from the one into which" F Belgium is giving support. But Section XII conflicts with Section X by stating the "support is not cut" by either A London or A Ruhr. It is hoped Mr. Calhamer intended to indicate Section XII is an exception to Section X and the support is not cut by the convoyed army; for, if the "support is not cut" by A Ruhr, per Section XII, F English Channel is dislodged and A Ruhr succeeds to Belgium, an adjudication which etumbles from the absurd to the ridiculous because it further conflicts with the statement in Section X that a dislodged unit cannot give support.

Example 4

ENGLAND: A Edi-Hol, F Nth C A Edi-Hol, A Bel S A Edi-Hol, F Eng S F Nth.

GERMANY: F Den-Nth, F Hol S F Den-Nth.

To pinpoint the conflicting absurdities in Section X and Paragraph 5 of Section XII:

a) According to Section X, F Holland cannot give support because it is dislodged by A Edinburgh.

b) According to Paragraph 5 of Section XII, F Holland can give support because its support cannot be cut by the convoyed army.

My recommendation to Gamesmasters is to interpret Section XII to mean the support is not cut by the convoyed army, unless the supporting fleet is dislodged.

It is believed Mr. Calhamer added Paragraph 5 of Section XII to the new Rulebook with the intention of providing a means within the new Rulebook to adjudicate "Pandin's Paradox." It is sad to report Paragraph 5 of Section XII does not in any way relate to "Pandin's Paradox" but does succeed in creating a new paradox.

#####

Comments on Mr. Beehara's article may be sent to the publisher.

And now we have -- THE GAMES:

"Fall 1909"

1970C

R-1

LITTLE CHANGE SEEN IN EUROPEAN WAR!

ENGLAND (Miller):

A Kie (S) FRENCH A Mun  
F Bal (S) FRENCH A Ber  
F Wes (S) FRENCH F Tus-Tyr [NSO]  
F Nwy-Nwg  
A Fin-StP  
A Swe holds  
F Bot (S) A StP\_Liv  
A StP-Liv  
F Bar (S) A Fin-StP

RUSSIA (Peery):

A Liv (S) A Pru  
A Mos (S) A Liv  
A Pru (S) A Liv  
A War (S) A Liv  
A Sil (S) A Pru  
A Boh (S) A Sil  
A Tyr-Pie  
A Alb-Nap  
A Tri-Tyr  
A Ven-Rom  
F Ion (C) A Alb-Nap  
A Apu (S) A Alb-Nap  
F Aeg (S) F Ion  
F Bla-Con

FRANCE (Comber):

F Nap (S) F Tun-Ion  
A Rom-Apu  
F Tun-Ion  
A Mar-Pie  
F Tus (S) A Mar-Pie  
F Lyo (S) ENGLISH F Wes-Tyr [NSO]  
A Mun(S) A Ber  
A Ber (S) A Mun  
A Gas-Bur  
A Ruh (S) A Mun

Underlined moves do not succeed. NSO is Not So Ordered.

SUPPLY CENTER CHART:

"Winter 1909"

RUSSIA (Peery): Mos, War, Sev, Vie, Ank, Bul, Bud, Rum, Smy, Con, Ven, Tri, Ser, Gre. (14) No change.

FRANCE (Comber): Par, Mar, Bre, Bel, Spa, Por, Tun, Mun, Ber, Rom, Nap. (11) Build 1.

ENGLAND (Miller): Liv, Lon, Edi, Nwy, Swe, Den, StP, Hol, Kie. (9) No change.

ITALY (CD): ~~Nap~~. (0)

Gain -- ~~Yps~~. Build for France is due 21 January 1972.

"Spring 1908"

1970AJ

R-2

LINES DRAWN FOR FINAL BATTLE OF WAR?

AUSTRIA (Leahey):

F Alb-Adr  
F Nap (S) TURKISH F Ion-Tyr  
A Pie-Mar  
A Tyr-Boh  
A Ven-Tyr  
A Sil (S) GERMAN A Ber  
A Pru (S) GERMAN A Ber

ENGLAND (Lakofka):

F Nwy-Nth  
F Bar-Nwy  
F Swe (S) F Bar-Nwy  
A Liv-Yor  
F Lon-Eng  
F Bre (S) A Mar-Gas  
A Mar-Gas  
A Pic-Bur  
A Kie (S) A Mun  
F Bal (S) GERMAN A Ber  
F Spa (sc)-Mar  
F Wes-Mid  
A Mun holds

TURKEY (Jordan):

A Fin-Nwy  
A StP (S) A Fin-Nwy  
A War-Liv  
A Rum-Gal  
A Con-Bul  
A Apu (S) AUSTRIAN F Nap-Rom [NSO]  
F Tus (S) F Ion-Tyr  
F Ion-Tyr  
F Aeg-Ion  
F Ank-Bla

GERMANY (CD):

A Ber [unordered; holds]

FRANCE (Schleicher):

A Par [unordered; holds]

Underlined moves do not succeed. NSO -- Not So Ordered. "Fall 1908" moves are due 21 January 1972.

~~~~~

"Fall 1903"

1971R

R-3

Following the "Spring 1903" moves, England retreats F Nth-Bel, and Turkey retreats A Smy-Syr [Annihilated -- dislodged from Syr].

"Fall 1903" moves, if not already received, are due 21 January 1972.

"Spring 1902"

1971CB

R-4

RUSSIA -- ?

FRANCE (Nozik):

A Pic-Bur  
A Mar (S) A Pic-Bur  
F Mid holds

ITALY (Lamb):

F Nap-Ion  
F Tun (S) F Nap-Ion  
A Ven-Tyr  
A Tri (S) A Ven-Tyr  
A Apu-Ven

ENGLAND (Almström):

A Nwy holds  
F Nrg-NAt  
F Lon-Eng  
F Nth-Ska

AUSTRIA (Brooks):

F Gra (S) A Ser-Bul  
A Bud (S) TURKISH A Bul-Rum  
A Vie-Gal  
A Ser-Bul

GERMANY (Devereaux):

F Den-Swe  
A Hol holds  
A Mun-Bur  
A Ruh (S) A Mun-Bur  
A Bar-Mun

TURKEY (Cleaver):

A Ank-Arm  
F Con-Ank  
F Aeg-Con  
A Bul-Rum

RUSSIA (Mischel):

A StP [unordered; holds]  
A Ukr "  
F Bla "  
F Sev "  
F Swe "  
A Rum [unordered; holds] [Dislodged & annihil.]

Underlined moves do not succeed. "Fall 1902" moves are due 21 January 1972.

~~~~~

"Winter 1901"

1971CQ

R-5

The players for Russia and Italy have not submitted their builds. Also, the player for Austria, Charles Cox, is dropping and a replacement is needed.

Drew McGee, Turkey, informs me that his new address is 97 Chester St., Apt. C-1, Allston, Mass. 02134.

The deadline for builds has been extended to 21 January 1972 for the countries mentioned.

"Winter 1901"

1971DF

R-6

AUSTRIA (Thorgaard): Builds F Tri.  
GERMANY (Ainsworth): No builds received.  
ITALY (Rice): Builds F Nap.  
TURKEY (Cox): Builds A Con.  
RUSSIA (Bagala): No change.  
FRANCE (Hoyer): Builde A Par, F Mar.  
ENGLAND (Passenheim): Builds F Lon.

"Spring 1902" moves are due 27 January 1972.

#####

#### PRESS RELEASES

R-1, 1970C:

St. Peerigrad; 23 November 1909:

The Government of the Holy Peerian Empire announced today that it had obtained sufficient proof to demonstrate that the existance of a sinister New York conspiracy to destroy the Peerian colony in Sandy Ego is not a myth but a reality. The Peerian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mistress Bagadesh, announced that the Peerian case would be presented to the League of Mini-States tribunal in Novi Sodom in the form of a 1,400 page letter entitled Veneral Venom.

R-3, 1971R:

Vienna; 28 February 1903:

Upon the unexplained disappearance of the beloved Emperor Franz Josef, the Archduke Ferdinand has assumed the Imperial Throne. The new Emperor fears that Turkish partisans had something to do with his grandfather's demise. Constantinople will be called Franzopolis in honor of the old Emperor.

Field HQ, Hungary; 13 March 1903:

Field Marshall Von Patton, Commander in Chief of the Northern Austrian Armies, pledged the destruction of the last Turkish Army north of the Black Sea. Von Patton's advance scouts have been ordered to bring back only heads. They will be used to build a memorial at Franzopolis.

R-4, 1971CB:

Serbia; 6 April 1902:

Baron Von Pattonwitz, Chief of Staff of the Austrian Armies in the field, stated today that he will follow the dictates of good military policy and will ignore the rantings of the Imperial Family. It is said that the Baron maintains a constant 24 hour guard on his private railway car.

Vienna; 12 April 1902:

The Emperor, when advised of the Baron's speech, said, "War is easier when played with little tin soldiers." The Emperor spent considerable time talking with a recalled envoy. This recalled envoy was not identified, but it was noted that he was warmly dressed. He was also questioned while hanging in chains upside down.

# PRESS RELEASES

R-4, 1971CB (continued):

Berlin; 6 May 1902:

The Kaiser announced today that the German Circus had arrived in France. The Circus is known for its daring acts. Thousands of Frenchmen cheered the Circus as it paraded through Burgundy. Asked when the beloved Circus would return to the Fatherland, the Kaiser is reported to have said, "The Circus will return when it has toured all of the French provinces."

R-6, 1971DF:

Trieste; 3 September 1901:

The King of Italy related today tales of his difficult escape from the bandits who have taken over his country. He told two dozen reporters from around the world representing such newspapers as the New York Tribune and the London Times of his daring escape from house arrest in his Venecian summer Palace to an Austrian cruiser which waited 3 miles offshore.

He pledged that he will regain his country from the bloody, lawless rule of the rebel Militarist party and its leader, one-time Cabinet Minister and full time bandit Ricardo Risso. The Emperor Franz Josef has given the King the use of the nearby Palace of Mirimar as headquarters for his government. The King has issued a call for men of all nations to join the international Italian Legion to help liberate the Italian homeland.

Constantinople; 12 September 1901:

Turkey has been willing to live in peace with Russia for a long while. Our peace has lasted up to and through the winter of 1900. Early in spring when war was first starting, Russia had made a war-time peace with Turkey. Russia had proposed that Turkey make a DMZ of the Black Sea. The Sultan sent his reply of approval back at once. Days later came the Czar's approval and his word that the Black Sea would be DMZ. This was a very tricky plan on the part of Russia. It was only in the late spring that Turkey found out about this backstabbing plan of Russia's and was able to stop Russia from controlling the Black Sea. Now that Russia has proven to be a peace breaker, it is time Europe joined Turkey to wipe out the government of the Czar and bring peace to the world. Lie all you wish Russia but the good is with Turkey.

Amsterdam; 11 December 1901:

During his review of the High Seas Fleet in the Zuider Zee, Kaiser Wilhelm noticed that the waves kicked up by the Fleet's passing had caused a small hole to appear in the dike he was standing on. Not wanting to see Holland flooded (or his boots get wet), the Kaiser ordered a corporal standing nearby to put his finger in the hole. Unfortunately, when the Kaiser departed, he forgot to send help back to the corporal, who at last report was still standing at the dike muttering something about coming back to Holland in about forty years with some of his friends and take the place over.

Berlin; 12 December 1901:

Chancellor Ainsworth held a Press conference today and said he was very dismayed at England's attempt to take over Denmark. Although not coming out and saying it, this reporter got the idea that if England tried it again, she might find herself at war with Germany.

## THE STRANGE CASE OF THE 1971BG(S)

This is a follow-up to the editorial I wrote in ATLANTIS #44, with such comments and criticisms that it has generated. These letters are in no particular order, just first to come to light is first typed.... Such comments as I have will appear within brackets -- []. I will try not to interrupt the writer too much with them.

Len Lakofka, 1806 N. Richmond, Chicago, Ill., 60647.

I agree that 1971BG has become TWO games, in reality. It is difficult to determine if the 'zine in which it is printed makes it the property of the GM or the publisher. Whosoever got the gamefees is the person in control of the game. To that party should go the 1971BG title, I believe.

The fact that the GM can remove a player, with "due cause" however, has not been tested by a vote of the existing players in that game. If he breaks an established Houserule, technically he could be removed. But that could be abused by a GM! I do believe that the GM can be dismissed by the players! Buddy Tretick is the prime example of an incompetent GM. He is late, consistently. He begins new games while leaving others dormant. He publishes La Guerre and does not include games, by the score, which have past his deadline. He makes arbitrary decisions on games, etc. A GM like this should be dismissed. In fact I'm moving to have this done in LRT (1970BI -- sic). It is his poor Games-mastering that has delayed the game and now he wants to blame the players!

What happens, Chris, if a GM does not act "responsibly"? Anyway, Chris, you say the players can't dismiss the GM but then proceed to say he must be competent! It seems, therefore, he can be dismissed!

[I think that what you and I disagree on are not the same things, exactly Len, what I said was that a GM has more of a right to the game than the players collectively, but I also said, "Once the gamesmaster is delinquent in fulfilling his responsibilities, he forfeits those rights to the players." You have given an example of a GM forfeiting his rights to the game by not meeting his agreed-upon responsibilities --, and I agree with you that if such is true, the GM should be dismissed!

[What we do not agree on is that in 1971BG the GM did NOT behave as you indicate Mr. Tretick has behaved in 1970BI ((sic)). 1971BG had not even progressed into 1901 (Fall), so there was not reason for GM laxity or incompetence. What's more, Mr. Beshara has a very good reputation of well-run games to his credit. Certainly better from what I've heard of Mr. Tretick's.

[Perhaps you see what I'm trying to say. We'll go on to the next letter for now.]

Rod Walker, (4719 Felton St., San Diego, California 92116.)

Since you asked, I guess I'll say something. Your account of what happened with 1971BG is not wholly accurate. I think it would help to put events in chronological order.

1. Larry [Peery] published VERITAS VINCIT.
2. John [Beshara] wrote to the players in 1971BG, informing them that (a) 1971BG was removed from PEERYARA, (b) Larry was summarily dismissed from the game, and (c) 1971BG would continue elsewhere. The players were not given a choice in this.
3. Larry wrote the players, asking their support for his position that John did not have the right to dismiss him from the game, nor to move the game out of PEERYARA. He also asked for the selection of a new GM (the three other

[Continued]



San Diego GMs were suggested, for ease of communication).

4. Five of the players, a clear majority, opted to keep the game in PEERYARA and to accept Hal Naus as the new GM.

5. Because two new players would have to be brought in, country assignments were shuffled so as not to disadvantage the replacements.

6. Beshara then wrote to say that (a) 1971BG would be in GRAUSTARK and that (b) Larry would be in the game.

7. Larry, rather than allow confusion to increase, requested a new game designation for the PEERYARA game (1971DL).

Your statement that "Larry Peery contrived to have Hal Naus adjudicate the game" (emphasis mine) is not in conformance with the facts.

[I must interrupt at this point. In a letter dated 9 September 1971, sent to all the players of 1971BG, Larry wrote that as publisher of PEERYARA he had made the decision to find a new GM if John did not wish to continue to have 1971BG published in PEERYARA, and further that he suggested the three San Diego area GMe -- you, Hal Naus and Conrad von Metzke -- BUT in the meantime, Larry set a deadline for "Spring 1901" move TO BE SENT TO HAL NAUS. This was in the same letter, suggesting that, or perhaps hinting would be a better word, he would prefer Naus. In another letter, dated 6 October 1971, Larry stated, "I have given Mr. Hidalgo and Mr. Nierenberg and Mr. Beshara every opportunity to respond to my communications and indicate their intentions to regard to this game. I have had no response.

"Therefore, I have asked Mr. Hal Naus, 1011 Barrett Ave. Chula Vista, Ca. 92011 (714-420-4237) to assume the functions of gamesmaster for us in this game."

[Mr. Beshara's letter informing the players that the game would continue with Larry in it, and published in GRAUSTARK, predates Larry's letter by two days -- 4 October 1971.]

[Continued:]

Now as to the legal question. The objections raised to Larry's analysis are remarkably similar. And they all proceed from an obvious lack of understanding as to what a contract is. [?] Whether the contract is one between 7 players and a Gamesmaster--and this has been the case in some games without question--or multiple between individual players and a GM, the facts remain the same: (a) the GM is the agent of the players, having been paid by them to perform a service, and (b) the contract is binding on all parties until and unless it is broken.

The contract in common practice consists of two parts. First, the GM contracts to administer the game, in conformance to the rules thereof, until it is over. Second, the players contract to accept the GM's House-Rules and his authority to rule where the HRs are silent. So long as the contract is not broken, these conditions apply (this explains why the GM has the power to remove defaulting players). The nit-witted notion that "contract" means the players can at any time vote to change the ground-rules has been raised by people who are in a hurry to discredit Peery, but not by him. Your statement, "once the gamesmaster is delinquent in fulfilling his responsibilities, he forfeits those rights to the players" is exactly what Larry said.

[Pardon me, but that is not exactly what Larry said. I will quote from XENOGOGIC, Vol. IV, 6.0, 24 September 1971, "Diplomacy and the Law", page /5/ (page 20), article 22: "Prior to the end of the game the seven individuals or remaining players may jointly declare, by majority decision, their contracts with the gamesmaster and/or publisher to be terminated. In doing so they must show cause. In such cases all rights revert to the seven individuals (the players) subject to the above."]

[Continued.]

Insofar as the publisher---obviously a game being conducted by carbon copy is still being published---by carbon copy. Where a separate entity, the publisher has rights. He is the legal owner of the back issues of the things he publishes, for instance. Furthermore, once an agreement has been made with him to publish, that agreement may not be broken just because one party feels the itch to split. Beshara agreed with Peery on the publication of PEERYARA. He cannot break that contract without Peery's OK. Larry is still fulfilling the contract by publishing the 'zine. Let me hasten to add that I consider 1971DL, despite the number change, to be the original PEERYARA game contracted for by Beshara. My records will so reflect it.

[I agree the publisher has the rights to the material that he publishes, but the right to material not published? But Larry has broken the "contract" he has with John unilaterally by resigning from the game after its transfer to GRAUSTARK. According to Larry's own explanations, he had a "contract" with John in a game as a player, and he removed himself from that "contract", with the results that he gives up any interest he has in the game/contract. (See XENOLOGIC, op cit., article 21.) Furthermore, as Larry has stated that the publisher has no rights to the game, letter 14 September 1971, I fail to see how you justify his actions in replacing John as GM when there was not any default on the part of the GM (after 4 October 1971).

[I still don't see why you consider 1971DL the original game. Perhaps you would like to give some clarification to me.]

Buddy Tretick, 3702 Wendy Lane, Silver Spring, Maryland 20906.

In general, I have no disagreement with the content of your article. Moreover, I support your position ... rather, you support my position. [?] There are reservations of course.

No one has mentioned the gamesmaster/publisher who has been operating for years at a loss (monetary loss) ... not due to inefficiency, but due to cost of publishing (Miller, Tretick, Childs, ...)

[Well, I'll mention it right now! To my knowledge, there is not a single publisher of Diplomacy 'zines today that does not operate at a loss constantly. In my own case, ATLANTIS costs about \$8 - \$10 per issue to print, of which I am reimbursed about \$2 per issue through game fees and subscriptions. As anyone can see, \$6 - \$8 per issue over say 20 issues per year can add up to quite a large amount of money. Which is one reason why 'zines tend to be late or fold up if the publisher does not have a steady income from somewhere else.

[Anyone who thinks about starting their own 'zine would be well advised to think about what this costs in the long run -- not to mention the initial outlay for printing facilities.]

[Continued:]

No one mentions the amount of time put in by the gamesmaster/publisher.

No one sees the long term gamesmaster/publisher (Koning, Kuch, Key, Just, McCallum, Tretick) who once in a while becomes involved in personal problems so great that he must defer Diplomacy to those problems.

On the first point: when the player starts paying his own way (total cost: time and materials) then he has "a contract".

Secondly: only ... I repeat ... only the gamesmaster who quits is in default of anything. Just because a couple of months (two or three move seasons) goes by because of his personal problems, does not mean he is in default of anything ... it simply means he is too involved in problems to publish at that time - no more, no less.

The movement afoot (created mainly by Walker) to take game[s] from one gamesmaster and give (burden) them to another and one gamesmaster or players

[Continued.]

elandering a gamesmaster for slowing down due to personal problems leavee much to be desired.

True, if a gameemaeter quits, the playere should, if they prefer, continue the game by any means. They must be willing to fund the continuation of that game though, not eimply impose that game on another gamesmaster without remuneration. Their game fee might have already been consumed by the publication cost.

Larry Peery, 816 24th St., San Diego, Ca. 92102.

Received ATLANTIS 44 today and several commente need to be made immediately.

First, regarding 1971BG, on 25 October 1971, I mailed a carbon copy letter to Beshara, Boardman, Labelle, Phillipe, Buchanan, and Walker outlining several proposale for the game. In that letter I did most of the things you asked for in your commente, including: gave up the 1971BG Boardman Number and asked for a new one, I requested Beshara/Boardman to allow playere who wanted to play in both gamee to do so without discrimination, and I resigned from the game along with Burt Labelle who hae also refused to participate in the game. This would indicate that Beshara's game will be missing two of the original seven playere, my game will be miseing two of the original playere, and that three of you (Hodin, Phillips, and yourself) will be in both. I accept that. I also said that these actione on my part were in the best interests of postal Diplomacy and that in no way did they detract from my previously stated poeition.

Second, in regard to Diplomacy and the Law.

I have no argument with paragraph 2.

In paragraph 3 I think you are wrong but it is a matter of my opinion vs. yours so you are certainly entitled to yours and I'll accept it as such. But, note this. I suggested a gamesmaster does not remove a player, the player removes himself by failing to fill the requirements of the contract. The same ie true of the gamesmaster, who by failing to fulfill the conditions of the contract, then removes himself. See the logical order of progression here: first, gamesmaeter (or player) fails to fulfill the qualifications of the contract, he thue breaks the contract, and finally by doing so removes himself from the game. The playere (or gamesmaster) then recognize this and replace him (or he them). It ie a caeua-effect [sic] relationship. Also, player(s) can remove a gameemaeter for not fulfilling the conditions of the contract as has been done in eeveral cases. The players have both an individual and a collective relationship to the gameemaster.

In paragraph 4 and 5 we agree.

In paragraph 6 the gamesmaster doee, as I specified, have certain rights but you muet specify what type of rights. For instance his rights to his magazine, republication of moves, etc. are clear. But I suggested he has no right to the game itself (that organiem which is defined by a Boardman number) which remains the common property of the playere.

Otherwise, I have no quarrel with what you say. I really don't have a quarrel anyway, just some differencee on mattere of semantics. I'm glad to see you discuseeing these things however.

[I think our main area of disagreeement liee in the area of the righte of the publisher. I personally think that the publisher has NO rights to the material he publishes, except the righte of possession of the published material. I don't think that the publisher has any right of control over the gamee he publiehes, just the material pertaining to the games that he doee publieh.

[I think that traditionally, the "contract" if you want to use that term, hae been between the gamesmaster and the publisher (when not one and the same)

for the publisher to print the record of the game, as supplied by the gamesmaster; not, as you seem to see it, for the publisher to furnish the gamesmaster for the game. The game operates under the rules as established by the gameemaster and the rules of the game, not under the rules of the publisher. It is the gamesmaster who has traditionally had control of the game, not the publisher.

[This is what our main bone of contention is, in my opinion. It is a matter of a difference of opinion, and I will continue to respect your opinion. Should you wish to comment on anything I have said, I will again be more than happy to print what you say.]

#####

Now for some more announcements, news, etc.

I understand that there are some game openings in the following 'zines:

LIAISONS DANGEREUSES/NEOPHYTE, Len Lakofka, 1806 N. Richmond, Chicago, Illinois 60647. Openings in LD for regular Diplomacy, open to all; openings in Origins of World War II, open to all; and openings in NEOPHYTE for novice players of Diplomacy only. For fees and a check on the availability of such openings, write Len for more details.

GRAUSTARK, John Boardman, 234 East 19th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11226. No openings for new games, but there are some positions left for stand-by positions in the games just begun. The fee for stand-by players is \$3.

LA GUERRE, Buddy Tretick, 3702 Wendy Lane, Silver Spring, Maryland 20906. I have never played in this 'zine so I do not have any first-hand information about quality, so if you join any of the games reported to be open, you may be disappointed. Take into consideration Len Lakofka's warnings (page 8) about irregularity and GM errors, but if you have money to blow....

XENOGOGIC, Larry Peery, 816 24th St., San Diego, California 92102. I don't know offhand of any openings, I haven't seen a copy for a while, but write anyway. There is something about a Larry Peery game or 'zine that makes you either love it or hate it. Pick up a copy at least and look it over. It can't hurt.

I also recommend HIGHLY a subscription to GRAUSTARK. Also, if you are at all serious about Diplomacy, join The Diplomacy Association. Membership is only \$1.00 per year, which includes a subscription to WAZIR, the latest one has just come out (14 pp.). Included is a very good article on "Fundamental Stalemate Positions" by John Beshara. Memberships are available by sending \$1 to Mr. John J. Beshara, Apt. 1021, 155 W. 68th St., New York, New York 10023.

Before I forget, I'd also like to mention PLATYPUS PIE, Brenton Ver Ploeg, 520 Parker Ave., #202, San Francisco, California 94118. Issue #2 just arrived here, and it looks quite good. There are games open at present -- fee of \$5.50, subscriptions are 8 issues for \$1.00, and it looks like they will be worth it.